

IN THE DRAWINGS

Corrected drawings are supplied herewith.

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on July 14, 2005.

Claims 1, 5-9, 12, and 15-17 are amended, no claims are canceled or added; as a result, claims 1-17 remain pending in this application.

Drawing Objections

The drawings were objected to because they include hand-drawn elements and hand-written labels. Corrected drawings are supplied herewith. No amendments are made to the drawings.

Specification Objections

The disclosure was objected to because of the following informalities:

“The specification appears to contain minor typographical and other errors. For example, on page 5, in paragraphs 0011 and 0012, it appears that references to "identify certificate 204 are intended to refer instead to "identity certificate 202"; on page 6, line 4 of paragraph 0015, it appears that "cert6ificate" is intended to read "certificate"; and on page 9, paragraph 0023, there is a reference to "the client 622", although reference numeral 622 indicates a certificate in Figure 6.”

Applicant thanks the Examiner for identifying these typographical errors and will cooperate as requested in correcting any further errors that Applicant becomes aware of.

Applicant has amended the specification as detailed above in the marked up replacement paragraphs. Entry of these amendments is requested.

§101 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 9-17 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 as being “directed to non-statutory subject matter.” Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. Nevertheless, Applicant has chosen to amend independent claim 9, from which claims 10-14 depend. Applicant has further amended independent claim 15, from which claims 16-17 depend. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9-17 are directed to statutory subject. Withdrawal of the § 101 rejection is earnestly requested.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claims 1, 5-9, 12, and 16 to clarify the claims. Entry of these amendments and withdrawal of the Section 112, second paragraph rejections is earnestly requested.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-9 and 12-16 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by McGarvey (U.S. 6,643,774; hereinafter “McGarvey”). Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion because McGarvey fails to teach or suggest the entirety of the claims.

For example, amended independent claim 1 recites in part, “providing, by the client to the third party, at least one second certificate and the universal resource identifier (URI), wherein the at least one second certificate identifies the third party. . . .” Applicant is unable to locate where a second certificate is disclosed that identifies the third party.

Further, the present subject matter as claimed removes the need of the third party and the client to renew authorization after a period of time because the authorization is verifies with every transaction. McGarvey describes systems and methods that operate to the contrary. For example, McGarvey at col. 12, lines 32-36 recites:

“Note that the private key system tickets obtained by the preferred embodiments are good only for a short period of time. After some period of time, it is necessary for the client and server machine to renew their public key authentication handshake so as to obtain fresh tickets from the private key system, via the same procedure as was used for the initial ticket or tickets.”

Thus, the systems and methods described in McGarvey all perform a procedure to renew the authentication after a period of time and not with every transaction via the “authorizer accessing the URI” as claimed.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 1 is patentable over McGarvey. Amended independent claims 9 and 15 include similar elements as amended independent claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2-8, 12-14, and 16 depend, directly or indirectly, from patentable claims 1, 9, and 15, respectively, and are allowable for the same reasons plus the elements of the claims. For example, claim 3 is directed to “a one-time use certificate” which Applicant is unable to locate within the teachings or suggestions of McGarvey. Applicant is further unable to locate in McGarvey where a client can limit a third party’s use of a first certificate as set forth in claim 5.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Section 102(e) rejection and allowance of claims 1-9 and 12-16 because McGarvey fails to teach or suggest all elements of the claims.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGarvey in view of Eastlake et al. "XML - Signature Syntax and Processing" (hereinafter “Eastlake”). Eastlake is provided to show “the use of XML signatures.” However, Eastlake fails to cure the deficiencies of McGarvey. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentable because it depends from allowable independent claim 9.

Claims 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGarvey in view of Ellison et al. "SPKI Certificate Theory" (hereinafter “Ellison”). However, Ellison fails to cure the deficiencies of McGarvey. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentable because it depends from allowable independent claim 9.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Section 103(a) rejections and allowance of claims 10-11 and 17.

Documents Cited but not Relied Upon for this Office Action

Applicant need not respond to the assertion of pertinence stated for the references cited but not relied upon by the Office Action since these references are not made part of the rejections in this Office Action. Applicant is expressly not admitting to this assertion and reserves the right to address the assertion should it form part of future rejections.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 349-9592) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

VICTOR B. LORTZ

By his Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 349-9592

Date Jan. 17, 2006

By Ann M. McCrackin
Ann M. McCrackin
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 17th day of January, 2006.

Amy Moriarty

Name

Signature

